

Post Book World 2/2/92

## Letters

### JFK: The Assassination

**Y**OUR review of Mark Lane's *Plausible Denial* (Book World, Dec. 15) was most unsatisfactory. You ought to have assigned that book to someone who is well-versed in the Kennedy assassination, someone who could tell us if the book is trustworthy or not. Your reviewer, Rory Quirk, was in over his head—and so were you when you chose him to do the review. We deserve and expect better.

JOHN LULVES  
Elverson, Pa.

**R**ORY Quirk's review of Mark Lane's most recent adventure in self-glorification is grossly unfair to the CIA and misleads and misinforms readers at a time when it also serves to promote Oliver Stone's monumental piece of disinformation about the JFK assassination.

How a lawyer, which Quirk is, could read as long and detailed a book about, ostensibly, a lawsuit, see such lengthy quotations, page after page of what as a lawyer he should have known was irrelevant in that lawsuit, yet not see a word of quotation of the judge's charge to the jury or the legal issue involved, and then unquestioningly quote Lane's fabrication of that issue, is beyond me.

This was a *libel* suit and nothing else. There was no other question before the court. The decision of the jury was that [E. Howard] Hunt "was not libelled" [in an article by an ex-CIA agent suggesting Hunt was part of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy]. The case was decided on absence of proof of "malice" by Hunt and his lawyers.

Lane also pretends that it is he who brought to light those originally withheld government records. He refers to hauling "truckloads" of them away from the FBI building. Any lawyer at all familiar with Freedom of Information Act litigation knows this is a very big lie.

Any perceptive reviewer, having read these repeated claims to have acquired all those records, should have wondered why in so long and detailed a book not a single statement is cited to any identifiable record.

Here you have Lane boasting, Horatio, at the bridge as he always is, along with Dick Daring, of having alone and unassisted gotten "truckloads" of FBI records; and what does he have in his appendix? Only dated self-promotion, all previously published. Why did he not publish a single one of the hundreds of thousands of pages he claims to have rescued from official oblivion?

HAROLD WEISBERG  
Frederick

**A**UTHORS prefer rave reviews; those among us who are realistic believe we are entitled only to a fair and impartial assessment.

In *Plausible Denial* I set forth facts which demonstrated the flawed and continuing commitment of The Washington Post and its intelligence writer, George Lardner, Jr., to the thoroughly discredited concept that the Warren Commission Report told the truth about the death of President Kennedy and the Post's hostility toward those who attempted to ascertain the facts.

When I learned that The Post's Book World was to review *Plausible Denial*, I looked forward to reading it with mixed emotions, especially since I had been critical in my book of a piece written by Jonathan Yardley, your book critic.

The review was written by a Washington lawyer, Rory Quirk, who appeared to imply that he was but a casual reader on the subject matter and that he had always accepted the conclusions of the Warren Report. It is entirely appropriate that Quirk shared that background information with your readers.

Quirk then presented the major points in *Plausible Denial* with scrupulous fairness. He concluded the review respectfully suggesting that one need not be as certain as I am that the facts demonstrate that the CIA was responsible for the murder of our president. Yet he had previously set forth some of the facts in meticulous detail which lead towards that conclusion.

My book received what I believe authors must be given as a matter of right—a fair hearing. Under the circumstances I consider that to be not routine but rather quite admirable.

MARK LANE  
Washington, D.C.